

## Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 05228 302236Z

70

ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 INR-10 L-03 NEA-10

NSAE-00 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SPC-03 USIA-15 TRSE-00

SAJ-01 SS-20 NSC-10 EB-11 ACDA-19 AF-10 OMB-01 MC-02

AEC-11 DRC-01 /166 W

----- 118622

R 302030Z OCT 73

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 2438

SECDEF WASHDC

S E C R E T USNATO 5228

E.O. 11652: GDS 12-31-81

TAGS: MCAP, NATO

SUBJECT: EWG MEETING OCT 30 ON BASIC ISSUES OF DEFENSE PLANNING

REF: A. USNATO 5164

B. USNATO 5193

C. STATE 212604

D. USNATO 5100

SUMMARY. DURING MEETING OCT 30 EWG HELD FIRST DISCUSSION ON DRAFT REPORT ON BASIC ISSUES OF DEFENSE PLANNING. NO DELEGATION HAD INSTRUCTIONS ON DRAFT REPORT BUT MANY REPS OFFERED COMMENTS ON INDIVIDUAL SECTIONS. US PROPOSAL FOR SHELTERING ALL AIRCRAFT THROUGH M-30 MET WITH RESISTANCE; US PROPOSAL ON ANTI-ARMOR WAS WELL RECEIVED. CHAIRMAN IS WILLING TO ACCEPT CHANGES TO DRAFT TEXT BUT DOES NOT INTEND TO ISSUE NEW TEXT BEFORE NEXT EWG MEETING ON THIS SUBJECT, SCHEDULED FOR NOV 13. ACTION REQUESTED: US ANALYSES ON AIRCRAFT SHELTERS TO SUPPORT US OBJECTIVES. END SUMMARY.

1. DURING EWG MEETING OCT 30, CHAIRMAN (PANSA) REFERRED TO DRAFT REPORT ON BASIC ISSUES OF DEFENSE PLANNING (REFTEL A), UNDERLINED URGENCY OF EWG WORK AND INVITED GENERAL COMMENTS ON SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 05228 302236Z

DRAFT.

2. MILITARY COMMITTEE REP (GEN TOMMASINI) WAS WILLING TO WORK ON CURRENT DRAFT BUT CAUTIONED THAT PRESENT EWG EFFORT NOT

CHANGE AD-70 PRIORITIES NOR HAZARD REDUCED PROGRESS ON OTHER AD-70 IMPROVEMENTS. PANSA REMARKED THAT RECENT EVENTS IN MID EAST HAD CONFIRMED THE IMPORTANCE OF ANTI-ARMOR AND PERHAPS AIRCRAFT PROTECTION.

3. DELEGATIONS WHO SPOKE INDICATED THEY WERE WITHOUT INSTRUCTIONS BUT COULD COMMENT ON SECTIONS OF PAPER ON PERSONAL BASIS.

4. ON SHELTERS FOR AIRCRAFT, CANADIAN REP (SHEFFIELD) CONFIRMED THAT CANADA HAD NO INTENTION OF PROVIDING SHELTERS FOR MORE THAN 70 PERCENT OF ITS AIRCRAFT. UK REP (MACDONALD) REFERRED TO INCOMPLETE PARA 8 OF REPORT (REFTEL A) AND SAID THAT SHAPE DOCUMENTATION WOULD BE THE KEY TO LEVEL OF SHELTERS TO BE RECOMMENDED. NETHERLANDS REP (CARSTENS) THOUGHT SHAPE'S POSITION WAS CRUCIAL. FRG REP (ARENDT) CONCURRED IN 100 PERCENT SHELTERING BUT REFERRED TO THE NEED FOR OPERATIONAL RESEARCH TO CONFIRM THE REQUIREMENT.

5. SHAPE REP (GEN MILLER), IN RESPONSE TO US REP'S QUESTION, SAID THAT SHAPE CONTINUES TO SUPPORT THE REQUIREMENT FOR 100 PERCENT SHELTERING FOR ASSIGNED AND EARMARKED (INCLUDING DUAL-BASED) AIRCRAFT BUT HAS RECOMMENDED THAT 70 PERCENT BE COMMON FUNDED AND REMAINING 30 PERCENT NATIONALLY FUNDED. HE REPORTED THAT SHAPE WAS STUDYING 80 PERCENT, 90 PERCENT, AND 100 PERCENT SHELTERING AND SOLICITED INFORMATION FROM NATIONS. US REP SAID HIS AUTHORITIES WOULD BE PROVIDING SOME RECENT ANALYSES ON SHELTERING TO SHAPE AND EWG.

6. ON SPECIFIC TEXTUAL CHANGES, US REP (PREDERGAST) PROPOSED, ON PERSONAL BASIS, CHANGES CONTAINED REFTEL B, EXPLAINED THAT AMENDED PARA 15A WAS LONG-TERM GOAL, AND SUGGESTED THAT EWG FOCUS ON AMENDED PARA 15B WHICH WAS IN LINE WITH SHAPE REQUIREMENT AND WAS THE IMMEDIATE OBJECTIVE.

7. FRG REP THOUGHT THAT PARA 15A SHOULD BE REWORDED TO REFER TO "AN OPTIMUM NUMBER OF SHELTERS" UNTIL RESULTS OF ADDITIONAL  
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 05228 302236Z

STUDIES WERE KNOWN. HE QUESTIONED USE OF M PLUS 30 AND SUGGESTED THAT IF WARNING TIME WAS SHORTER, REQUIREMENTS WOULD DIFFER.

8. US REP REQUESTED PROVISIONAL REPORT ON STUDIES FROM SHAPE REP FOR NEXT EWG MEETING.

9. CHAIRMAN (HUMPHREYS, PANSA HAVING DEPARTED) CITED FURTHER NEEDS: GREATER SPECIFICATION AS TO THE CATEGORIES OF AIRCRAFT TO WHICH EWG RECOMMENDATIONS WOULD APPLY; SHAPE INPUT FOR PARA 8; CONSIDERATION OF M PLUS 30 TIME FRAME. COMMENT.  
MAJORITY OF DELEGATIONS WHO SPOKE ARE UNWILLING TO ACCEPT REQUIREMENTS

FOR ADDITIONAL SHELTERING WITHOUT DOCUMENTATION FROM SHAPE.

HENCE, EARLY PROVISION OF US ANALYSES TO  
SHAPE AND TO EWG IS NECESSARY IF WE EXPECT TO ACHIEVE OUR  
OBJECTIVE. END COMMENT.

10. ON ANTI-ARMOR, US REP CIRCULATED STATEMENT (SEPTTEL) DRAWN  
FROM REFTTEL C. UK REP SUPPORTED NATIONAL DETERMINATION OF PHASE  
2 STANDARDS. SHAPE REP SAID US PROPOSAL WAS MOST HELPFUL AND THAT  
ITS PHASING WAS SOUND. FRG REP INDICATED THAT FRG ARMY STAFF WAS  
PREPARING A PAPER ON ANTI-ARMOR WHICH HE HOPED TO CIRCULATE NEXT  
WEEK. US REP SUGGESTED THAT RECOMMENDATIONS IN US PAPER BE SUB-  
STITUTED FOR CURRENT PARA 28 IN DRAFT AND PROPOSED SPECIFIC  
AMENDMENT IN REFTTEL B. FRG REP CONCURRED WITH AMENDMENT.

11. ON WAR RESERVE STOCKS, US REP (GEN BOWMAN) PROPOSED AMEND-  
MENTS IN REFTTEL B AND SUGGESTED THAT EWG REVIEW LIST OF CRITICAL  
ITEMS WHICH SHAPE HAD SUBMITTED TO SUB-GROUP.

12. CHAIRMAN ACKNOWLEDGED THAT DELEGATIONS HAD BEEN WITHOUT  
INSTRUCTIONS, URGED THEM TO SEEK NATIONAL GUIDANCE ON DRAFT  
REPORT, SUGGESTED THAT ANY CHANGES SUBMITTED BE IN THE FORM OF  
DRAFT AMENDMENTS, AND ANNOUNCED THAT HE DID NOT RPT NOT INTEND  
TO CIRCULATE A REVISED DRAFT FOR EWG'S NEXT MEETING NOVEMBER 13.

13. COMMENT. WE ARE OPTIMISTIC ON SECTIONS CONCERNING WAR  
RESERVE AND ANTI-ARMOR (PROVIDED FRG ARMY PAPER IS NOT AT ODDS  
WITH US SUBMISSION). ON AIRCRAFT PROTECTION, MISSION STRONGLY RE-  
COMMENDS EARLY PROVISION OF US ANALYSES TO NATO SHOWING VALUE OF  
GOING FROM 70 PERCENT TO 100 PERCENT SHELTERS IN THE CENTRAL  
SECRET

PAGE 04 NATO 05228 302236Z

REGION FOR IN-PLACE AND DUAL-BASED AIRCRAFT. ANY ADDITIONAL  
JUSTIFICATION FOR  
ULTIMATE GOAL OF SHELTERS FOR ALL AIRCRAFT THROUGH M PLUS 30  
WILL BE MOST HELPFUL.  
END COMMENT.  
MCAULIFFE

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 02 APR 1999  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** n/a  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 30 OCT 1973  
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** boyleja  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1973NATO05228  
**Document Source:** ADS  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** 11652 GDS 12-31-81  
**Errors:** n/a  
**Film Number:** n/a  
**From:** NATO  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1973/newtext/t19731064/abqcecyd.tel  
**Line Count:** 149  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE  
**Office:** n/a  
**Original Classification:** SECRET  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 3  
**Previous Channel Indicators:**  
**Previous Classification:** SECRET  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** A. USNATO 5164 B. USNATO 5193 C. STATE 212604 D. USNATO 5100  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** boyleja  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 17 AUG 2001  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <17-Aug-2001 by elyme>; APPROVED <26-Sep-2001 by boyleja>  
**Review Markings:**

Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
30 JUN 2005

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** EWG MEETING OCT 30 ON BASIC ISSUES OF DEFENSE PLANNING  
**TAGS:** MCAP, NATO  
**To:** STATE  
**SECDEF**  
**Type:** TE  
**Markings:** Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005